ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ವಿಧಾನ ಪರಿಷತ್ತು

ಚುಕ್ಕೆ ಗುರುತಿಲ್ಲದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	661
ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರು	ಡಾ: ವೈ. ಎ. ನಾರಾಯಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಶಿಕ್ಷಕರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ)
ಉತ್ತರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ದಿನಾಂಕ	04.03.2021
ಉತ್ತರಿಸಬೇಕಾದವರು	ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಸಚಿವರು

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ.	ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ	ಉತ್ತರ
ಅ)	ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಸನ್ನದ್ದುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಷ್ಟು; (ಜಿಲ್ಲಾವಾರು ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡುವುದು)	ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ 2020-21ನೇ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಸಾಲಿಗೆ (ಜನವರಿ ಅಂತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ) ನವೀಕರಣಗೊಂಡ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ರೀತಿಯ ಸನ್ನದುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಒಟ್ಟು 11,357 ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಜಿಲ್ಲಾವಾರು ಸನ್ನದುಗಳ ವಿವರವನ್ನು **ಅನುಬಂಧ-1**ರಲ್ಲಿ ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.
ಆ)	ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಿಗದಿಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಶುಲ್ಕ ಎಷ್ಟು; (ಶುಲ್ಕಗಳ ವಿವರ ನೀಡುವುದು)	ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಬಕಾರಿ (ದೇಶೀಯ ಹಾಗೂ ವಿದೇಶಿ ಮದ್ಯ ಮಾರಾಟ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1968ರ ನಿಯಮ 8ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಸನ್ನದುಗಳಿಗೆ ಪಾವತಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಸನ್ನದು ಶುಲ್ಕ ಹಾಗೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸನ್ನದು ಶುಲ್ಕಗಳನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಪಡಿಸಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಯಮದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಬಂಧ-2ರಲ್ಲಿ ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.
ಇ)	ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಸನ್ನದ್ದುಗಳಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವ ಆದಾಯ ಎಷ್ಟು;	ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ 2020-21ನೇ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 11,357 ಸನ್ನದುಗಳಿಂದ ಜನವರಿ ಅಂತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ರೂ.602.95 ಕೋಟಿಗಳ ಸನ್ನದು ಶುಲ್ಕ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ)	ಸಿಎಲ್–2 ಹಾಗೂ ಇನ್ನಿತರೆ ಸನ್ನದ್ದುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಳಾಂತರ ಮತ್ತು ಹಸ್ತಾಂತರಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಿಗದಿಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ಶುಲ್ಕ ಎಷ್ಟು; ಈ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಿಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಕವಾಗಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ;	ಸಿಎಲ್–2 ಹಾಗೂ ಇನ್ನಿತರೆ ಸನ್ನದುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಬಕಾರಿ (ಸನ್ನದುಗಳ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1967ರ ನಿಯಮ 23ರನ್ವಯ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಳದಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ಥಳಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಲು ಶೇ.50 ರಷ್ಟು ಸನ್ನದು ಶುಲ್ಕ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸನ್ನದು ಶುಲ್ಕವನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸನ್ನದನ್ನು ಒಬ್ಬರ ಹೆಸರಿನಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ಪಾಲುದಾರಿಕೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಪಾಲುದಾರಿಕೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ಕಂಪನಿಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಂಪನಿಯ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಬಕಾರಿ (ಸನ್ನದುಗಳ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1967ರ ನಿಯಮ 17–ಬಿರನ್ವಯ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಆ ಸನ್ನದಿಗೆ ನಿಗಧಿಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ದುಪ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಸನ್ನದು ಶುಲ್ಕ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸನ್ನದು ಶುಲ್ಕಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾವತಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಇರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಬಕಾರಿ (ಸನ್ನದುಗಳ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1967ರ ನಿಯಮದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಬಂಧ–3ರಲ್ಲಿ ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಿಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಕವಾಗಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.
ಉ)	ಬಂದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಕ್ರಮಗಳೇನು? (ವಿವರ ನೀಡುವುದು)	ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲಂಘಿಸಿ ಸನ್ನದು ಸ್ಥಳಾಂತರ ಮತ್ತು ಹಸ್ತಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಯಮಾನುಸಾರ ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿರುವ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು **ಅನುಬಂಧ–4** ರಲ್ಲಿ ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆಇ 08 ಇಎಲ್‌ಕ್ಯೂ 2021

(ಕೆ. ಗೋಪಾಲಯ್ಯ)
ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಸಚಿವರು

ಅನುಬಂಧ -1

2020-21ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ (ಜನವರಿ ಅಂತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ) ನವೀಕರಣಗೊಂಡ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ರೀತಿಯ ಸನ್ನದುಗಳ ವಿವರ.

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ	ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳು	ಸನ್ನದುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ
	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಭಾಗ (ಉತ್ತರ)	
1	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ – 1	429
2	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ – 2	431
3	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ – 3	396
4	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ – 4	353
5	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ	220
6	ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರ	182
7	ತುಮಕೂರು	379
	ಒಟ್ಟು	**2390**
	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಭಾಗ (ದಕ್ಷಿಣ)	
1	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ – 5	455
2	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ – 6	449
3	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ – 7	523
4	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ – 8	408
5	ಕೋಲಾರ	254
6	ರಾಮನಗರ	183
	ಒಟ್ಟು	**2272**
	ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ವಿಭಾಗ	
1	ಬಾಗಲಕೋಟೆ	284
2	ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಉತ್ತರ	292
3	ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ದಕ್ಷಿಣ	359
4	ವಿಜಯಪುರ	238
5	ಧಾರವಾಡ	278
6	ಹಾವೇರಿ	171
	ಒಟ್ಟು	**1622**
	ಕಲಬುರಗಿ ವಿಭಾಗ	
1	ಬೀದರ್	168
2	ಕಲಬುರಗಿ	297
3	ರಾಯಚೂರು	230
4	ಯಾದಗಿರಿ	107
	ಒಟ್ಟು	**802**
	ಹೊಸಪೇಟೆ ವಿಭಾಗ	
1	ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ	327
2	ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ	243
3	ದಾವಣಗೆರೆ	267
4	ಗದಗ	142
5	ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ	168
	ಒಟ್ಟು	**1147**
	ಮಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಭಾಗ	
1	ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಕನ್ನಡ	506
2	ಕೊಡಗು	225
3	ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ	275
4	ಉಡುಪಿ	403
5	ಉತ್ತರ ಕನ್ನಡ	161
	ಒಟ್ಟು	**1570**
	ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಭಾಗ	
1	ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ	127
2	ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು	231
3	ಹಾಸನ	357
4	ಮಂಡ್ಯ	277
5	ಮೈಸೂರು ನಗರ	330
6	ಮೈಸೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ	232
	ಒಟ್ಟು	**1554**
	ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಒಟ್ಟು	**11357**

[1][5-A. Renewal of licence.—(1) The Excise Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner, as the case may be, may on an application made to him along with the licence fee prescribed in Rule 8 renew the licence granted under these rules [2][except wholesale licence granted in Form CL-1 or Form CL-1 (Beer), for the period commencing from 1st July, 2006.].

(2) Every such application shall be made at least one month before the expiry of the licence already granted:

Provided that the Excise Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner, as the case may be, may accept and consider any such application made after the aforesaid period of one month, if he is satisfied that the applicant had sufficient cause for not making the application within that period.

(3) The licences granted prior to the first of July, 1999 may be renewed at the discretion of the Excise Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner, as the case may be on payment of 50% (fifty per cent) of the fee prescribed under Rule 8 in respect of the entire period for which licence was not granted, for the purpose of maintaining continuity of the licences:

Provided that while renewing the licence under this sub-rule the Deputy Commissioner or the Excise Commissioner, as the case may be shall ensure that the total number of licences granted or renewed do not exceed the quota fixed in Rule 12, for grant of each kind of licence for an area.]

CASE LAW

Rule 5-A — As amended by Karnataka Excise (Sale of Indian and Foreign Liquors) (Second Amendment) Rules, 2000 — Licence — Grant or renewal of — It has to be granted or renewed for whole excise year, and not for fraction of excise year — Renewal of licence for only three months after collecting licence fee for whole excise year, held, bad in law.

It is not in dispute that the authorities have no power to renew the licence for a break up period. When the Rule provides that the licence has to be renewed from one excise year to another excise year the respondents have granted licence only for a period of three months after collecting the licence fee for the whole year. The respondents- authorities have no right to collect the licence fee for a break up period under the Act. When they have no right to collect the licence fee for a break up period, they have no right to grant licence for a break up period. In other words, there is no justification on the part of the respondents to collect the licence fee for the whole year and grant the licence for a period of three months only. — *S.N. Chinappa v State of Karnataka and Others*, **2001(5) Kar. L.J. 234.**

Rule 5-A — Petitioners prayed for writ of *mandamus* directing respondents to renew lapsed licences by accepting 50% of prescribed licence fee for lapsed period — Sub-rule (3) of Rule 5-A makes it clear that if licences granted prior to 1-7-1999 may be renewed on payment of 50% of fee prescribed under Rule 8 of Rules in respect of lapsed period — Petitioners

1. Rule 5-A inserted by Notification No. FD 12 PES 2000, dated 24-6-2000, w.e.f. 24-6-2000.
2. Inserted by Notification No. FD 06 PES 2006(7), dated 19-6-2006, w.e.f. 1-7-2006.

have obtained licences after 1-7-1999, benefit or concession provided under Rule 5-A(3) not applicable to them — Demand notice issued by authorities calling upon petitioners to deposit entire arrears of licence fee cannot be said to be illegal or bad in law — Petition dismissed.

Mohan Shantanagoudar, J., Held: The bare perusal of Rule 5-A of the Rules would make it clear that the application for renewal of licence shall be made either before the Excise Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner as the case may be, along with the licence fee prescribed under Rule 8 of the Rules for renewal of licence. Rule 8 of the Rules prescribes specified fees for obtaining licence. Thus, the applicant shall have to pay the required licence fee for getting the licence renewed. Such an application shall be filed at least one month prior to expiry of the licence already granted. However, the Excise Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner as the case may be, may condone the delay in filing the application if he is satisfied that the applicant had sufficient cause for not making the application within a period of one month. Sub-rule (3) of Rule 5-A of the Rules further makes it abundantly clear that if the licences granted prior to 1st July, 1999, if lapsed, may be renewed at the discretion of the Excise Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner as the case may be, on payment of 50% of fee prescribed under Rule 8 of the Rules in respect of the lapsed period. The language used in Rule 5-A(3) of the Rules is plain and unambiguous. Hence, the said provision has to be read as it is. There is no scope for reading or interpreting the same in any other manner than its plain meaning. Thus, as the petitioners have obtained licences after 1- 7-1999 the benefit or concession provided under Rule 5-A(3) is not applicable to them. The plain reading of the said provision makes it clear that they are not entitled for the concession for payment of 50% of the licence fee for the lapsed period. — *Narasegowda v State of Karnataka and Others*, **2008(3) Kar. L.J. 74.**

[1][**5-B. Wholesale licences in Form CL-1 and Form CL-1 (Beer) not to be renewed.**—Notwithstanding anything contained in Rule 5-A wholesale licences granted or renewed in Form CL-1 or Form CL-1 (Beer) in the year 2005-06 or earlier years shall not be renewed for the period commencing from 1st July, 2006.]

6. Restriction on the use of premises.—No premises shall be used for the sale of [2][Indian Liquor (other than arrack)] or Foreign Liquor or both unless it is approved by the Deputy Commissioner of the District.

CASE LAW

R. 6 — Karnataka Excise Licenses (General Conditions) Rules, 1967 — Sale of Indian made Foreign liquors — Licenced premises — Order to shift the premises — Opportunity of being heard necessary before directing shifting. — *C.L. Kalappa v Deputy Commissioner (Excise)*, **1990(1) Kar. L.J. 226 : ILR 1990 Kar. 1689.**

1. Rule 5-B inserted by Notification No. FD 06 PES 2006(7), dated 19-6-2006, w.e.f. 19-6-2006.
2. Substituted for the word "Indian" by GSR 273, dated 3-8-1972, w.e.f. 4-8-1972.

R. 6 — Karnataka Excise Licenses (General Conditions) Rules, 1967 — Sale of Indian made Foreign liquors — Licenced Premises — Powers of Deputy Commissioner to direct shifting from one place to another place having regard to the public interest — *Held*, Power to direct shifting of premises is inherent in the Licencing Authority and it is part of the original power which is vested in Deputy Commissioner to approve a shop at the time of granting the licence — Explained. — *C.L. Kalappa v Deputy Commissioner (Excise)*, **1990(1) Kar. L.J. 226 : ILR 1990 Kar. 1689.**

7. **Duration of Licence.**—All licences other than "Special Licences" and "occasional licences" [1][granted or renewed] shall be valid for the year or where a licence is granted [2][or renewed] on any date after the 1st July until the 30th June thereafter:

[3][x x x x x.]

CASE LAW

Rules 7 and 8 — Retail vend of liquor — Duration of licence issued in Form CL-2 for — Duration is only for excise year for which it is issued — Fresh licence is required to be obtained by paying prescribed fee for subsequent year, and fresh licence so obtained is not expired licence renewed — Where licensee had discontinued business after expiry of licence obtained by him for particular year and has applied for licence after gap of some years, licence fees for years during which he had not obtained licence, cannot be recovered from him for issuing licence for subsequent year he has applied for.

There is no question of renewal of licence and, therefore, when an application for licence is considered for a particular year, the Department cannot recover licence fee for the earlier years. In view of it, respondents will have to consider the petitioner's application for grant of licence for the year 1999-2000 without demanding any amount as licence fee for the previous years when petitioner did not seek licence. — *Narayana v State of Karnataka and Others*, **2000(5) Kar. L.J. 30.**

8. **Fees to be paid.**—(1) The licence fee for the several kinds of licences shall be as follows, namely.—

[4][[5][1. x x x x x

1-A. x x x x x]

[6][2. Retail Shop Licence referred to in clause (2) of Rule 3 in the case of,—

(a) City Municipal Corporations having population more than 20 lakhs. Rs. 6,00,000/- per year

1. Inserted by Notification No. FD 12 PES 2000, dated 24-6-2000, w.e.f. 24-6-2000.
2. Inserted by Notification No. FD 12 PES 2000, dated 24-6-2000, w.e.f. 24-6-2000.
3. Proviso omitted by Notification No. FD 9 PES 2000, dated 23-6-2000, w.e.f. 1-7-2000.
4. Items 1 to 12 substituted by GSR 191, dated 28-6-1980, w.e.f. 1-7-1980.
5. Clauses (1) and (1-A) omitted by Notification No. FD 06 PES 2006(7), dated 19-6-2006, w.e.f. 1-7-2006.
6. Item 2 substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.

(b) Other City Municipal Corporations areas Rs. 5,00,000/- per year

(c) City Municipal Council Areas Rs. 4,50,000/- per year

(d) Town Municipal Council Areas or Town Panchayat areas Rs. 4,00,000/- per year

(e) Other areas. Rs. 4,00,000/- per year.]

3. Licence to Chemists and Druggists Rs. 100 per year

[1][4. Licence to clubs referred to in clause (4) of Rule 3, in the case of.—

(a) City Municipal Corporations areas having population more than 20 lakhs Rs. 6,50,000 per year

(b) Other City Municipal Corporation areas Rs. 5,00,000 per year

(c) City Municipal Council areas Rs. 4,00,000 per year

(d) Town Municipal Council or Town Panchayat areas Rs. 2,00,000 per year

(e) Other areas Rs. 2,00,000 per year]

[2][5. Occasional licence referred to in clause (5) of Rule 3 Rs. 10,000/- per day.]

[3][6. Special licence referred to clause (6) of Rule 3 Rs. 10,000 per day.]

[4][6-A. Star Hotel Licence referred to in clause (6-A) of Rule 3 Rs. 10,00,000 per year]

[5][7. Hotels and Boarding Houses licence referred to in clause (7) of Rule 3, in the case of.—

(a) City Municipal Corporation areas having population more than 20 lakhs Rs. 8,50,000 per year

(b) Other City Municipal Corporations areas Rs. 7,50,000 per year

(c) City Municipal Council areas Rs. 5,50,000 per year

1. Item 4 substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
2. Item 5 substituted by Notification No. FD 09 PES 2007, dated 29-6-2007, w.e.f. 1-7-2007.
3. Item 6 of Rule 8 substituted by Notification No. FD 17 PES 2015, dated 4-11-2016, w.e.f. 4-11-2016.
4. Item 6-A substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
5. Item 7 substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.

d) Town Municipal Council or Town Panchayat areas	Rs. 5,00,000 per year
(e) Other areas	Rs. 4,00,000 per year]
[1][7-A. Tourist Hotel licences referred to in Clause 7-A of Rule 3	Rs. 30,000/- per year]
[2][7-B. Tourist Hotels Beer Bar Licence referred to in clause (7-B) in Rule 3	Rs. 1,000/- per year]
[3][7-C. Licence to supply liquor on Board of Train engaged and run by the Tourism Development Corporation of the State Government or Central Government under clause (7-C) of Rule 3	Rs. 10,00,000/- per year]

[4][(7-D) Hotel and Boarding House Licenses owned by the person belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes specified in clause (7-D) of Rule 3, in the case of.—

(a) City Municipal Corporation areas having population more than 20 lakhs	Rs. 8,50,000 per year
(b) Other City Municipal Corporation areas	Rs. 7,50,000 per year
(c) City Municipal Council areas	Rs. 5,50,000 per year
(d) Town Municipal Council/Town Panchayat areas	Rs. 5,00,000 per year
(e) Other areas	Rs. 4,00,000 per year]
[5][8. Military Canteen Licence referred to in clause (8) of Rule 3	Rs. 250/- per year]
[6][8-A. Military Canteen Stores Bonded Warehouse licence	Rs. 1,25,000]
[7][8-B. Border Security Force/Para Military Unit Licence	Rs. 100 per year]

[8][9. Refreshment Room (Bar) Licence referred to in clause (9) of Rule 3 in the case of.—

1. Item 7-A substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
2. Item 7-B substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
3. Item 7-C substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
4. Item 7-D substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
5. Item 8 substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
6. Item 8-A substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
7. Item 8-B of Rule 8 inserted by Notification No. FD 12 PES 95(iv), dated 29-6-1996, w.e.f. 29-6-1996.
8. Item 9 substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.

(a) City Municipal Corporation areas having population more than 20 lakhs	Rs. 7,50,000/- per year
(b) Other City Municipal Corporations areas	Rs. 6,00,000/- per year
(c) City Municipal Council areas	Rs. 5,00,000/- per year
(d) Town Municipal Council Areas/ Town Panchayat Areas	Rs. 4,00,000/- per year
(e) Other areas	Rs. 4,00,000/- per year]
10. Auctioner's Licence	Rs. 20/- per year
11. Licence for retail sale of bottled toddy	Rs. 250 /- per year
[1][12. x x x x x	x x x x x]
[2][13. x x x x x.]	
[3][14. (a) Licence for running duty-free shop at International Airport; and	Rs. 10,000/- per year.
(b) Distributor licence to sell foreign liquor	Rs. 50,00,000/- per year.]
[4][15. Retail shop licence issued to Government Companies	Rs. 4,00,000 per year]
[5][16. Refreshment Room (Bar) Licence at International Airport	Rs. 12,50,000 per year.]

[6][(2) x x x x x.]

[7][(3) x x x x x.]

[8][(4) The Excise Commissioner may demand payment of a sum in the nature of privilege fee specified in Section 24 of the Act subject to such guidelines and procedure as the State Government may issue in this regard from time to time.]

1. Item 12 omitted by Notification No. FD 03 PES 2015, dated 28-5-2016, w.e.f. 28-5-2016
2. Item 13 and Note of Rule 8 omitted by Notification No. FD 16 PES 2003(i), dated 30-6-2003, w.e.f. 30-6-2003.
3. Item 14 substituted by Notification No. FD 03 PES 2015, dated 28-5-2016, w.e.f. 28-5-2016.
4. Item 15 substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
5. Item 16 substituted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2016, dated 23-6-2016, w.e.f. 1-7-2016.
6. Sub-rule (2) omitted by Notification No. FD 06 PES 2011, dated 1-8-2014, w.e.f. 1-8-2014.
7. Sub-rule (3) omitted by Notification No. FD 06 PES 2006(7), dated 19-6-2006, w.e.f. 1-7-2006.
8. Sub-rule (4) inserted by Notification No. FD 16 PES 2003(i), dated 30-6-2003, w.e.f. 30-6-2003.

[1][(5) Privilege fee for Distributor Licence shall mean and include the rate or amount determined by way of notification by the State Government from time to time, at any time in a year. The Privilege fee fixed by the State Government shall be payable by the Distributor Licensee to the State Government during the period of licence for the year with effect from 1st day of July to 30th June thereafter.]

CASE LAW

Rule 8 — Indian Contract Act, 1872, Section 29 — Licence fee — Enhancement and recovery of — Licensee paying existing fee and agreeing to pay fee as would be enhanced in accordance with proposal of Government — Proposed enhancement held in abeyance pending disposal of litigation between licensees and Government — Agreement to pay enhanced fee, not void for uncertainty as parties knew terms of proposed enhancement — Absence of statutory provision to collect enhanced fee, not relevant where payment of fees is governed by terms of contract — Enhanced fee fixed under rules in accordance with policy of Government and after inviting and considering objections thereto from public and affected parties cannot be held unconscionable.

A careful perusal of these agreements will make it clear that not only the liability to pay the existing licence fee is discharged, but it is also made clear that licence fee for the relevant year is going to be enhanced and in that event he is ready to pay the difference of licence fee immediately on hearing from the department. A contract which is intended to be binding on a party is certainly enforceable even though certain terms may not have been precisely set forth in the agreement, if the nature of the said terms can be ascertained from the surrounding circumstances. It cannot be said that the parties concerned could not give a meaning to the expressions used in these agreements to state that what the enhancement could be and with reference to what period or the rate of enhancement and what the difference could be. When these aspects were clearly in the mind of the parties at the time of entering into agreements, the petitioners would not be justified in contending that the contract between the parties is void for uncertainty. *The argument that there is no power to demand or collect short levied licence fee in the absence of a specific provision under the statute may not be of much significance in this case because of the agreements entered into between parties and the nature of licence fee being consideration for contract. Thus we are in the realm of contract and not power being exercised by any authority over the citizens under a statute such as in case of collection of compulsory exactions like tax or fee. In such latter cases necessarily there ought to be a specific provision for collection of short levy. When the parties have agreed to pay the licence fee, as may be enhanced, the contention that the respondents have no power to enforce such a clause in the absence of a specific provision in the statute is not tenable at all. It is clear that this is a case where the petitioners accepted to carry on trade in liquor subject to the policy of the S... The policy of the State* has been explained in the budget presented to the legislature and after following the procedure under Section 71 of the Karnataka Excise Act relevant rules have been framed after inviting objections from the concerned persons and the licence fee has been fixed under these rules. The licence to be granted is in the nature of a contract, but even so, all the terms thereof are prescribed under statutory rules framed after publication of a draft, calling for objections, considering such objections with the further requirement of laying such rules in the legislature. This kind of contract which contains the terms laid down under statutory rules comes into existence after following a hybrid procedure which is both contractual and statutory. Such contracts are not susceptible to the attack of being unconscionable to be invalid under the Contract Act. — *K.G. Hanumantha Raju and Others v State of Karnataka and Others*, **1996(5) Kar. L.J. 719A.**

1. Sub-rule (5) inserted by Notification No. FD 08 PES 2013, dated 27-8-2013, w.e.f. 27-8-2013.

Rule 8 — Legislature competent to charge licence fee for parting with privilege to vend liquor — Licence fee is in nature of consideration for contract and not fee or tax or compulsory extraction from party — Principles applicable to delegated legislation regarding tax or fee not applicable to collection of licence fee.

It is no longer open to the petitioners to contend that the legislature has no competence to charge or collect licence fee for parting with the privilege to vend in Indian or Foreign liquor. Section 24 of the Act consists of two parts, namely, the introductory part that instead of or in addition to any excise duty or countervailing duty leviable under Sections 22 and 23, which is put in parenthesis, and the operative part that the State Government may accept payment of such a levy of licence fee or privilege fee as may be prescribed in consideration of grant of a lease or licence or both, by or under the Act. Section 24 as amended enables not only acceptance of certain consideration in the form of fee called licence fee or privilege fee, but also for grant of licence or lease of the said privilege. Section 24 makes it clear that the State Government may accept payment of a sum or levy such licence fee or privilege fee in consideration of grant of a lease or licence or both. In order to part with a lease or licence, consideration could be collected and such consideration could be collected under this provision for the purpose of granting licence or lease. What is provided under Section 24 is in the nature of a consideration for contract and is not at all in the nature of any levy of fee or tax or compulsory exaction from a party. When the Government proposed lease or licence on right to vend in Foreign/Indian liquor, the party concerned has a choice in the matter and there is no element of compulsion involved at all. Hence, the principles applicable to delegated legislation in respect of levy of fee or tax cannot be applied at all. — *Karnataka Wine Merchants' Association (Regd.), Bangalore and Others v State of Karnataka and Others*, **1995(4) Kar. L.J. 214A.**

ಅನುಬಂಧ-3

between the legal heirs, a direction in the writ petition to transfer the licence to one legal heir would not be possible. . . . . . . Insofar as the claim as made by respondent 4 under a *Will*, certainly the right of respondent 4 also cannot be adverted to in the instant writ petition since it is for the Competent Court to decide all these aspects of the matter. Therefore in such circumstance, the *mandamus* as sought cannot be issued. The parties are at liberty to avail their remedies in accordance with law. – *Smt. Hamsamma and Others v The Excise Commissioner in Karnataka, Shanthinagar, Bangalore and Others*, **2016(2) Kar. L.J. 635.**

[1][**17-B. Transfer of licence in other cases.**—(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in Rule 2, licences issued.—

(i) for Sale of Indian Liquor (other than arrack) or Foreign Liquor or both, in Form No. CL-1 (Wholesale licence) or CL-2 (retail shop licences) [2][CL-6A (Star Hotel Licence)] or CL-7 (Hotel and Boarding House Licences) [3][or CL-7D (Hotel and Boarding House Licences owned by the person belonging to Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes)] or CL-9 (Refreshment room (Bar) Licence under the Karnataka Excise (Sale of Indian and Foreign Liquors) Rules, 1968; or

(ii) for sale of Beer under the Karnataka Excise (Lease of Right of Retail Vend of Beer) Rules, 1976;

The Deputy Commissioner may on an application by the licensee and [4][subject to payment of transfer fee equivalent to twice the annual licence fee] specified in Rule 8 of the Karnataka Excise (Sale of Indian and Foreign Liquors) Rules, 1968 or Rule 5 of the Karnataka Excise (Lease of Right of Retail Vend of Beer, Rules, 1976, as the case may be, and with the prior approval of the Excise Commissioner, transfer such licence in favour of any person named by such licence, if such person is eligible for grant of a licence under the Karnataka Excise Act, 1965 or the rules made thereunder:

[5][Provided that in case of a Licence granted in Form CL-7D (Hotel and Boarding House Licences) to a person belonging to the Scheduled Castes shall be transferred only to a person belonging to the Scheduled Castes and the Licence granted in Form CL-7D to a person belonging to the Scheduled Tribes shall be transferred only to a person belonging to the Scheduled Tribes, as the case may be. In the case of Partnership Firm, all the partners shall belong to the Scheduled Castes or the Scheduled Tribes, as the case may be. In the case of a Company incorporated under the Companies Act, 2013,

1. Rule 17-B inserted by GSR 64, dated 23-5-1995 and shall be deemed to have come into force w.e.f. 1-4-1995.
2. Inserted by Notification No. FD 03 PES 2007(2), dated 25-5-2007, w.e.f. 25-5-2007.
3. Inserted by Notification No. FD 08 PES 2014, dated 21-11-2014, w.e.f. 21-11-2014
4. Substituted for the words "subject to payment of transfer fee equivalent to the annual licence fee" by Notification No. FD 05 PES 2013(II), dated 28-2-2013, w.e.f. 1-3-2013.
5. Proviso inserted by Notification No. FD 08 PES 2014, dated 21-11-2014, w.e.f. 21-11-2014

all the Directors shall belong to the Scheduled Castes or the Scheduled Tribes as the case may be.]

(2) Nothing in this rule shall apply to transfer of licence under Rule 17-A.]

CASE LAW

Rule 17-B — Transfer of CL-9 licence — Order of Excise Commissioner rejecting the claim — No reason stated for rejecting the transfer — Impugned order set aside — Matter remitted back for reconsideration in accordance with law.

H.G. Ramesh, J., Held: Why the licence cannot be transferred under the above Rule is not stated. Hence, the impugned order dated 11-2-2015 (Annexure-J) is liable to be set aside. The matter requires to be reconsidered by respondent 2. The impugned order dated 11-2-2015 is set aside. The matter is remitted to respondent 2 for reconsideration in accordance with law. All contentions of both the parties are kept open. Respondent 2 shall dispose of the petitioner's claim expeditiously and in any event within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The petition stands disposed of accordingly. – *Smt. Bhagirathi v State of Karnataka and Others*, **2015(3) Kar. L.J. 292.**

[1][**18. Authorised persons only to be in-charge.**—The licensed shop shall not be put in the charge of any person other than the one authorised by the licensee and in respect of whom a nowkarnama is issued by the Inspector of Excise. A Court-fee stamp of rupees two shall be affixed to each nowkarnama. A certificate from the Health authority to the effect that the persons so authorised are not suffering from any contagious disease, shall be produced by the licensee before the Inspector of Excise once in six months.

This provision shall be applicable to employees working in Breweries, Distilleries, Wineries and also toddy tappers working under toddy licensees.

Explanation.—For the purpose of this rule Health authority means "any Registered Medical Practitioner.]

19. Report of breach.—Every breach of the conditions of the licence or provisions of the Karnataka Excise Act, 1965 by any servant of the licensee or other person shall immediately be reported by the licensee to the Excise Officer and the licensee shall comply with the orders of the Excise Officer in this behalf.

20. Licensee not to be interested in Excise Officer.—No licensee shall have any pecuniary transactions with the Officers of the Department of Excise, Police or Revenue.

21. Inspection.—(1) The following officers shall be authorised to inspect any shop,—

(a) Any Excise Officer not below the rank of Sub-Inspector of Excise;

1. Rule 18 substituted by GSR 359, dated 3-12-1975, w.e.f. 11-12-1975.

(b) Any Revenue Officer not below the rank of Tahsildar;

(c) Any Gazetted Officer of the Medical or Health Department.

(2) The licensee shall produce the receptacles kept for measurements of the liquor at the time of Inspection.

(3) The licensee shall maintain an inspection book and other registers as may be prescribed by the Excise Commissioner and keep a record of all inspection notes and make proper entries. The Inspection Book shall be delivered to the Excise Officer on the termination of the lease period.

CASE LAW

Rule 21 — Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, Section 482 — Prayer — For quashing of FIR — Offences — Under the Karnataka Excise Act, 1965 — Search conducted without recording the grounds for his belief — That such an offence committed — Held, such probable defence is available only at the time of trial, thus writ petition is dismissed.

N. Ananda, J., Held: Search conducted by an officer, without recording of the grounds for his belief that an offence under the Act was likely or being committed would vitiate entire proceedings and investigation of first information would be abuse of process of law. ...... It is not possible to take into consideration the probable defence that may be available to petitioner during trial. At this stage, it is not possible to hold that there was violation of the provisions of Section 54 of the Act. Such contention can be raised only after final report is filed against petitioner. — *Smt. Mahananda v State of Karnataka*, **2013(1) Kar. L.J. 178.**

22. Conviction entails cancellation of all licences.—Where a licensee holds more than one licence and he is convicted for breach of conditions of any one of such licences, the other licences also may be cancelled.

[1][**23. Shifting of shops.**—Subject to the restrictions specified in Rule 5, the Deputy Commissioner may permit a licensee to shift the location of his shop from one place to another within the limits of a Grama Panchayat or within the [2][Municipal Area] or City Municipal Corporation] [3][on payment of a fee equivalent to [4][fifty per cent] of the licence fee charged on the licence in respect of such shop:]

[5][x x x x x:]

1. Rule 23 substituted by Notification No. FD 22 PES 93(ii), dated 9-5-1994, w.e.f. 9-5-1994.
2. Substituted for the words "territorial division of Municipality" by GSR 119, dated 19-7-1994, w.e.f. 19-7-1994.
3. Inserted by Notification No. FD 5 PES 2000, dated 28-4-2000 and shall be deemed to have come into force w.e.f. 1-4-2000.
4. Substituted for the words "twenty-five per cent" by Notification No. FD 03 PES 2014(V), dated 28-2-2014, w.e.f. 1-7-2014.
5. First proviso omitted by Notification No. FD 08 PES 2011, dated 6-8-2014, w.e.f. 6-8-2014.

[1][Provided further that subject to Rule 5, in case of CL-2 [2][and CL-9] licences, the Deputy Commissioner may permit a licensee to shift the location of his shop.—

(a) within the limits of Municipal Area/Town Panchayat Area or City Municipal Corporation;

(b) from category (a), (b), (c) and (d) areas to category (e) area of item 2 [3][and item 9] of sub-rule (1) of Rule 8 of the Karnataka Excise (Sale of Indian and Foreign Liquors) Rules, 1968 within the District;

(c) within category (e) area of item 2 [4][and item 9] of sub-rule (1) of Rule 8 of the Karnataka Excise (Sale of Indian and Foreign Liquors) Rules, 1968 within the District.]

24. Licensee not entitled to compensation.—Where a licence is cancelled during the currency of the licence, the licensee shall not be entitled to any compensation of any kind.

---

1. Second proviso inserted by Notification No. FD 7 PES 2008(II), dated 15-1-2009, w.e.f. 15-1-2009.
2. Inserted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2009, dated 9-2-2010, w.e.f. 9-2-2010.
3. Inserted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2009, dated 9-2-2010, w.e.f. 9-2-2010.
4. Inserted by Notification No. FD 11 PES 2009, dated 9-2-2010, w.e.f. 9-2-2010.

ಅನುಬಂಧ-4

ಚುಕ್ಕೆ ಗುರುತಿಲ್ಲದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 661 ರ ಕ್ರಸ (ಉ) ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂ.	ಕಡತ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ / ನೌಕರರ ಹೆಸರು ಪದನಾಮ ಶ್ರೀಯುತ/ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ	ವಿಷಯ	ಜರುಗಿಸಲಾದ ಕ್ರಮ
1)	ಇಸಿಇ/ಎಂಎಲ್ ಆರ್/04/ಡಿಎಸ್ ಸಿ(3)/2011	ಹೆಚ್. ಎನ್. ಆನಂದ್, ಅಂದಿನ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಉಪ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು (ನಿವೃತ್ತ)	ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಪಿ.ನಾಣಯ್ಯ ಬಿನ್ ಲೇಟ್ ಕೆ.ಡಿ.ಪುಟ್ಟಪ್ಪ ಇವರ ಸಿಎಲ್-9 ಸನ್ನದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂಲ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಸ್ಥಳಾಂತರ ಆದೇಶ ನೀಡಿ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ಲೋಪ ಎಸಗಿರುವುದು.	ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆದೇಶ ಸಂ. ಆಇ 32 ಇಪಿಎಸ್ 2013, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ: 02.07.2020 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್. ಎನ್. ಆನಂದ್, ಅಂದಿನ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಉಪ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು (ನಿವೃತ್ತರು) ಇವರು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಲೋಪವೆಸಗಿರುವುದು ಸಾಬೀತಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಾಗರೀಕ ಸೇವಾ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಯ ನಿಯಮ 214(1)(ಎ) ಅಡಿ ಇವರ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ವೇತನದ ಶೇ. 10 ನ್ನು ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ಅವಧಿಯವರೆಗೆ ತಡೆ ಹಿಡಿಯುವ ದಂಡನೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತದೆ.
2)	ಇಸಿಇ/14/ಸಿಆರ್ ಎಂ/ಬೆಂ(ಪೂ)/2017-18/ ಡಿಎಸ್‌ಸಿ(1)	1) ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಶೈಲಜಾ ಎ. ಕೋಟೆ, ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಉಪ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು. 2) ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಗಿರಿ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಉಪ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು 3) ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಚಂದ್ರು, ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಉಪ ಅಧೀಕ್ಷಕರು	ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ (ಪೂರ್ವ) ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ರಾಜಮಹಲ್ ವಿಲಾಸ ವಲಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯ ಸಹಕಾರ ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮೆ: ನೇಸರ ಗ್ರಾಂಡ್ ಬಾರ್ ಅಂಡ್ ರೆಸ್ಟೋರೆಂಟ್ ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರಿನ ಸಿ.ಎಲ್-9 ಸನ್ನದು ಎರಡೂ ವಲಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಲು	ತಪ್ಪಿತಸ್ಥ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಇಲಾಖಾ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಗೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಚಾಲ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

		4) ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಕವಿತಾ ಕೆ. ಅಬಕಾರಿ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು 5) ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಗೀತಾ ಡಿ. ಅಬಕಾರಿ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು	ಕಾರಣರಾದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ/ನೌಕರರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮದ ಕುರಿತು	
3).	ಇಸಿಇ/ಬಿಎನ್‌ಜಿ/12/ ಡಿಎಸ್‌ಸಿ (1)/2014	1. ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ ಆರ್. ಗದ್ದಿ, ಅಂದಿನ ಪ್ರಭಾರದಾರಕ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಉಪ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು, 2. ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ವಿ.ಎನ್. ಮಂಜುಳಾ, ಅಂದಿನ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು, ಬಾಣಸವಾಡಿ ವಲಯ,	ಬಾಣಸವಾಡಿ ವಲಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂಲ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಬಾರ್ & ರೆಸ್ಟೋರೆಂಟ್ ನಡೆಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ / ನೌಕರರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮ ಜರುಗಿಸುವ ಕುರಿತು.	ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆದೇಶ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಆಇ/162/ಇಪಿಎಸ್/ 2014, ದಿನಾಂಕ:16.12.2020 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ ಆರ್. ಗದ್ದಿ, ಅಂದಿನ ಪ್ರಭಾರಿ ಅಬಕಾರಿ ಉಪ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು, (ನಿವೃತ್ತ) ಇವರಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಪಿಂಚಣಿಯಿಂದ ಶೇ. 10 ರಷ್ಟು ಪಿಂಚಣಿ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ಅವಧಿಗೆ ತಡೆಹಿಡಿಯುವ ದಂಡನೆಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಮಂಜುಳಾ ವಿ.ಎನ್. ಅಬಕಾರಿ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಎರಡು ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವೇತನ ಬಡ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಚಿತ ಪರಿಣಾಮರಹಿತವಾಗಿ ತಡೆಹಿಡಿಯುವ ದಂಡನೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆಇ 08 ಇಎಲ್‌ಕ್ಯೂ 2021